

**REMARKS**

Reconsideration and allowance of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-4 and 6-12 remain pending in the application. Claim 5 has been cancelled. New claims 13-21 have been added.

Claim 5 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. In response, claim 5 has been cancelled.

Claims 1-4, 6-7, 9-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rolleston and further in view of Syeda-Mahmood. In response, the claims have been amended and are believed to be unpatentable over the applied references for the reasons discussed below.

Claim 1, for example, has been amended to recite that the data specified as “data of differences between color specification values corresponding to a color chip and color specification values corresponding to a desired target color.” The explanation for this amendment is described on page 7, line 20 – page 10, line 2, in the specification, and Figures 3-5.

For example, a user (client) inputs data of a color chip whose color is similar to a target color. The color chip is selected with visual evaluation. Color specification values corresponding to the color chip are stored in a computer. A screen shown in Figure 5 is then displayed.

The user visually compares the color chip in the target color, and selects the differences of the color specification values of the selected color chip and those of the target color. Such selection may be carried out by clicks of a mouse on the table shown on the screen. The two kinds of data are obtained; data of the color specification values of the color chip, and data of the differences between color specification values corresponding to the color chip and those corresponding to the target color. The color specification values of the target color can be calculated based on the two kinds of data.

Amended claim 1 is a clarification of previous claim 5 which was not substantively rejected, but was rejected for indefiniteness.

According to Rolleston, an original journal is scanned by means of a scanner to generate an image. The image is printed with a color printer in accordance with colors defined by the

scanner. Scanning output is commonly transformed to a color space of tristimulus values. The values are device independent (column 1, line 60 – column 2, line 11).

Colors defined in a first color space are converted to colors defined in a printer color space using compiling look up tables representative of printer characteristics.

Rolleston does not teach a CCM (Computer Color Matching) calculating system for calculating a blending ratio of colorants.

According to amended claim 1, differences between color specification values corresponding to a color chip and color specification values corresponding to a desired target color are received. The color specification values of the target color can then be calculated based on stored color data and the differences. Such a process is not described in Rolleston and Syeda-Mahmood.

Rolleston instead is directed to calibrating a color printer. This is not the same as the system recited in amended claim 1 or the method recited in amended claim 11. Syeda-Mahmood does not overcome the deficiencies discussed with respect to Rolleston. Accordingly, for at least these reasons, the obviousness rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 2-10 and 13-21 recite additional important limitations and are patentable for the reasons discussed above with respect to the independent claims as well as on their own merits.

All objections and rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the present application should be in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including

extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 07-1337 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

**LOWE HAUPTMAN GILMAN & BERNER, LLP**



Kenneth M. Berner  
Registration No. 37,093

1700 Diagonal Road, Suite 300  
Alexandria, Virginia 22314  
(703) 684-1111  
(703) 518-5499 Facsimile  
Date: August 28, 2003  
KMB/jd